DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 820 UD 023 472

TITLE	A Perspective on the Socio-Economic Status of Chicago-Area Blacks.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Urban League, Ill. Dept. of Research.
PUB DATE	Nov 83
NOTE	33p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Blacks; Census Figures; *Family Income; *Hispanic Americans; *Metropolitan Areas; Minority Groups; *Racial Differences; Racial Relations; Residential Patterns; *Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois (Chicago); Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

ABSTRACT

This report examines one subset of the 1980 U.S. Census to assess the socioeconomic status of Blacks and Hispanics relative to non-Hispanic Whites in Chicago, and to minorities in the 10 other Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) in the United States with populations greater than 2.5 million. Eight indicators of socioeconomic disparity (including such factors as median family income, percent of individuals and families below the poverty level, and unemployment rate) are examined and presented in a series of tables. The report points out that Hispanics and, even more so, Blacks continue to fare worse than Whites; and that these disparities are far greater in Chicago than in other major urban areas. Several hypotheses based on demographic explanations (such as, "the greater the Black proportion of the population, the lower will be Blacks' relative socioeconomic status") are explored, but each is disproved and the report concludes that no single factor explains these racial inequities. Alternative hypotheses tentatively advanced are that Blacks are more segregated residentially in Chicago than in any other major metropolitan area; that "boss" politics have funneled most resources to non-Black sections of the community; and that midwestern conservatism and ethnic hostility are part of the root causes of the large socioeconomic gap between races. (CJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Fox

Chicago Urban League

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

The publication of U.S. Census data is a slow process -- one which has been slower than usual for 1980. Most of the more interesting social and economic figures have only become available in the last year. While the media have provided quick encapsulated views of some highlights, several more years of careful analysis will be needed to draw out the full meaning and implications of the 1980 Census.

This article examines one small subset of Census data in an attempt to assess the status of blacks and Hispanics in Chicago. The status of local minorities cannot be assessed fully by simply examining several social and economic indicators in isolation. In order to put such indicators in perspective, we often relate them to other, similar data — data about the same group at a different point in time or about non-minorities.

In looking at 1980 Census data, we will be examining the standing of blacks and Hispanics in Chicago relative to non-Hispanic whites. The gap between blacks and whites and the gap between Hispanics and whites on socio-economic indicators is the notion which shall be referred to in this article as minority-majority disparities.

In order to assess the magnitude of the disparities which exist in Chicago, a second sort of comparative approach will also be used. Chicago's disparities will be compared to those found in other major metropolitan areas in the United States. Ultimately, what we will be able to determine in this report is how well Chicago's minority populations are doing compared to minorities in other urban centers. Normally, such inter-metropolitan comparisons must be interpreted with

great care. Minorities may fare better in some urban centers than others because the social and economic conditions in these centers are better overall.

By using disparity measures rather than indicators for minorities, alone, however, we can largely eliminate inter-metropolitan differences in the socio-economic status of minorities which are affecting virtually everyone in the metropolis equally. This will bring into relief those differences among minorities in major urban centers which are specifically and excessively affecting minorities.

Methods

To be more precise, the data for the Chicago Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) will be compared to that for all ten other SMSAs in the country with at least 2.5 million population. This population cut-off point is only somewhat arbitrary. As one goes much below this size, some of the SMSAs do not have appreciable numbers of either blacks or Hispanics. Thus, a comparison of Chicago with other metropolitan areas becomes increasingly inappropriate, if not impossible. The 2.5 million population cut-off assures that each SMSA has more than 150,000 blacks and more than 50,000 Hispanics in residence.

The population composition of the eleven urban centers included in this study are presented in Table 1. The Nassau-Suffolk (counties) SMSA refers to Long Island, New York, which is a large, relatively well-to-do surburban area of New York City, but is treated by the Census Bureau as separate for statistical purposes from the New York SMSA. Though all the SMSAs are large, they fall into two distinct size groupings: (1) Chicago, Los Angeles-Long Beach, and New York with populations between 7.1 million and 9.1 million; and (2) all the others which range from 2.7 million to 4.7 million. The black percentage of the population ranges between

27.9% in Washington, D.C. and 5.8% in Boston. These may seem low, but remember that the data base is entire metropolitan areas rather than central cities alone. The percentage of non-Hispanic whites (or the non-minority component of the population) ranges from a low of 67.6% in New York to a high of 91.9% in Nassau-Suffolk. The range for Hispanics spreads between 27.6% in Los Angeles-Long Beach and 1.7% in Detroit. With the exception of Los Angeles-Long Beach, every metropolitan center has more blacks than Hispanics, though Houston and San Francisco-Oakland have Hispanic populations nearly as large as their black populations. At the other extreme, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. are very dominantly black in the make-up of their minority residents. Boston and Nassau-Suffolk have very few blacks or Hispanics.

The social and economic indicators included in this article are all those in a recent Census data report[1] which seem to reflect something meaningful about the status of minorities. That is, unemployment rates and percent completing high school tell us something about how well minorities are doing relative to non-minorities in employment and education. On the other hand, median rent paid was not included as an indicator because it is quite equivocal in meaning. Are minorities doing better if they pay more or less in rent than non-minorities? Without knowing about the quality of housing and the neighborhoods in which minorities and non-minorities live, or without being able even to express rentals as a proportion of household income, disparities in median rent paid cannot be interpreted unambiguously.

A brief description of the eight indicators used here is provided below:

Median Family Income - This is the amount which divides all families into two equal sized groups, one having incomes above the median value and one having incomes below the median value. Unlike mean family income or per capita income (which uses a mean), the median family income measure is not particularly affected by extreme amounts. Thus it is probably the best single indicator of typical or representative income.

Percent Below Poverty Level - This measure refers to persons, rather than to family or household units. However, all family members and unrelated individuals are classified as being below or above the poverty level based on household income in 1979. Poverty is measured by an index which provides a range of income cut-offs or "poverty thresholds" varying by size of family, number of children and age of the family householder or unrelated individual. For a family of four the threshold was $7,412. This measure focuses on the extent to which a group has a large proportion of low-income people. Median family income, on the otherhand, emphasizes where the middle of the income distribution is.

Labor Force Participation Rate - This indicator reflects the percentage of all persons 16 years of age and older who either were employed during the week of the Census or, if unemployed, had looked for work during the prior four weeks and were available to accept work. Thus, it supposedly measures the degree of active involvement or interest in the work world.

Population Employment Ratio - The percentage of all persons 16 years of age or older who were employed, during the week of the Census. This indicator reflects employment rate without differentiating among reasons or subclasses of those not working. It includes discouraged workers who are ignored in computations of the unemployment rate. Thus, it measures overall level of work participation.

Unemployment Rate - The percentage of those 16 years of age or older who were not employed during the Census week but had looked for a job during the prior four weeks and were available to accept work. Thus, it measures the unemployment rate among those actively participating in the labor force.

Percent Female-Headed Household with Children - The percentage of all households in which the adult female owns or rents the unit in her name, had no husband present, but does have her own child or children under 18 years of age living there. This indicator not only reflects the rate of absentee fathers but also is one imperfect measure of the extent and embeddedness of poverty and unemployment in minority communities since roughly 75% of black community poverty is in female headed households and the need for supportive services is especially high in these households if the female is to become financially self-sufficient.

Percent 25 Years Old High School Graduate or More - The percentage of all persons 25 years of age or older who have completed at least four years of high school. This indicates very roughly the minimal educational achievement and minimal marketable job skills of the group.

Percent Owner-Occupied Housing Unit - The percentage of all year-round, occupied housing units in which the usual resident is the owner of the unit. This measure partially reflects the extent of financial investment in housing and the extent of community commitment and stability among neighborhood residents.

Findings

The figures for each indicator of disparity between blacks and whites and between Hispanics and whites are presented in Tables 2 through 9. Their inclusion is chiefly for the benefit of those readers who may have a particular interest in or

use for one or more of these indicators on a comparative basis. While we believe they merit the reader's perusal, there is no need — for the purposes of this article -- to discuss them individually in any detail. Generally, they show that blacks and Hispanics, with rare exceptions, continue to fare worse than whites. This is especially true for blacks. With the exception of labor force participation rates in the Nassau-Suffolk SMSA, blacks' socio-economic status in 1980 was worse than whites' on every measure in every city. This entails lower status on 87 of 88 indicator-SMSA combinations. For Hispanics, their socio-economic status was worse than non-hispanic whites on 78 of 88 indicator-SMSA combinations. The ten instances of reversed status were clustered in labor force participation rate (5), population-employment ratio (4) and unemployment rate (1).

Of more immediate relevance are Tables 10 and 11, which summarize the rank-orderings of SMSAs on all the indicators for blacks and Hispanics, respectively. As in Tables 2 through 9, a ranking of "1" indicates that the particular SMSA had the largest minority-majority disparity among all 11 urban centers on that measure. Conversely, a SMSA with a ranking of "11" had a smaller minority-majority disparity than any of the other SMSAs. In those few instances when the minority group had a higher status than the majority group, rankings were at the "11" (rather than the "1") end of the ordering.

First, in relation to blacks, it is apparent that the disparities in socio-economic status between blacks and whites are far greater in Chicago than in any other major metropolitan area in this country. Chicago's blacks had the largest negative disparity on three of the eight indicators, were tied for first on another measure, were second among the 11 SMSAs on two other measures, and were third the remaining two times. No other urban center even comes close to matching this ignominious record. The sum of Chicago's rankings on these eight indicators was

14.5, or an average ranking of 1.76 on a scale of 1 to 11. The city with the second worst overall ranking, Detroit, had 30.5 cumulative rankings, or a 3.81 average.

The circumstances for Hispanics are not quite the same. As Table 11 indicates, Boston, rather than Chicago, exhibited the greatest overall disparity in socio-economic status between Hispanics and majority whites. Chicago, nonetheless, does not have an enviable record compared to other major urban centers. As the fourth worse metropolitan area of 11, Chicago ranks fairly near the top. While the Hispanic-white gap in Boston is noticeably larger overall than in other cities (2.25 average ranking), the overall pattern for Chicago (4.50 average ranking) is nearly as large as in the two cities tied for second worse ranking -- New York and Philadelphia (4.38) -- and is far larger than in all the remaining cities (Houston being next with an average ranking of 5.62).

INTERPRETATION

The most salient finding from our data analysis is the extraordinarily low socio-economic status of blacks relative to majority whites in Chicago (in comparison to black-white differentials in other cities). How can this finding be accounted for? What is it about Chicago which has produced such uncommonly high relative deprivation for local black residents? The data already contained in this study enable us to examine several hypotheses which are based on demographic explanations. Each hypothesis will be stated and considered separately.

The greater the black proportion of the population, the lower will be blacks relative socio-economic status.

This might make sense on several grounds including the proposition Gordon Allport

formulated many years ago in his classic, The Nature of Prejudice. Allport asserted that as the size of the minority group increases relative to the majority group, the majority group is more likely to perceive the minority as a threat and to intensify discriminatory actions in order to assert control over this perceived threat. The data, however, do not support this hypothesis as a factor accounting for Chicago blacks' extraordinarily low socio-economic status. Though Chicago does have a relatively high proportion of blacks, being fourth highest of 11, this ranking should not make Chicago uniquely different from other SMSAs. Similarly, other SMSAs deviate substantially from the pattern predicted by this hypothesis. Washington, D.C. and New York are the SMSAs with the largest proportions of blacks, yet they rank fifth and seventh on relative socio-economic status. On the other extreme, Boston has the smallest proportion of blacks, but has the third worst ranking in terms of blacks' relative socio-economic status.

The larger the black-Hispanic proportion of the population, the lower will be blacks' relative socio-economic status.

The same logic as the previous hypothesis would be applicable here. The only difference is that blacks and Hispanics are viewed as a single minority group eliciting a greater or lesser discriminatory response from the white majority against both groups. The data, however, do not support this modified hypothesis. Los Angeles-Long Beach, New York, and Houston have the largest combined proportions of blacks and Hispanics, but they rank 10.5, 7, and 9, respectively on relative socio-economic status of blacks. The comparable rankings for Hispanic socio-economic status are 8, 2, and 5. On the other extreme, Boston has by far the lowest combined proportion of blacks and Hispanics but ranks third worst on black-white socio-economic disparity and worst of all on Hispanic-white socio-economic disparity.

The larger the population of the SMSA, the lower will be blacks' relative socio-economic status.

This hypothesis suggests that something about absolute size has particularly negative consequences for blacks. This "something" could be greater impersonality, higher per capita costs for delivering public services, less efficient bureaucratic institutions facing more mammoth urban problems, or some other factor. Sheer size, however, does not account for the relative standing of blacks in these SMSAs. New York, L.A.-Long Beach, and Chicago are the three largest SMSAs, but the rankings of blacks' socio-economic status in these areas are spread among 7, 10.5, and 1. Similarly, Nassau-Suffolk, Boston, and Houston are the three smallest SMSAs, but their rankings are widely dispersed: 10.5, 3, and 9.[2]

The lower the SMSA on overall socio-economic status, the lower will be blacks' relative socio-economic status.

Essentially, this hypothesis postulates that when there are fewer resources to go around, minorities will get a decreased proportion of those resources. The haves only share with the havenots during periods of relative abundance. This notion is consistent with a "last hired, first fired" situation. To assess this hypothesis, one must examine the comparative socio-economic status of majority whites in the various SMSAs, and then examine the relationship between these rankings and those for black-white differences. Unlike previous hypotheses one cannot inspect the rankings of Tables 10 and 11 and the demographic data in Table 1 to test its suitability. The standings of whites are spread among all of Tables 2 through 9. For this reason, the ranking of whites in these tables have been summarized in Table 12 along with a composite ranking of the eight individual

measure rankings.

The data seem to come somewhat closer to substantiating this hypothesis than any of the previous ones. SMSAs like Dallas-Ft. Worth, Houston, and Nassau-Suffolk tend to rank whites high and black-white disparities low. Similarly, Boston, Detroit and Philadelphia have relative low rankings for whites and relatively high rankings for black-white disparities. Nonetheless, several other SMSA do not fit the pattern: Washington, D.C. has the highest overall ranking for whites but is ranked in the middle on black-white disparities; New York has the lowest ranking for whites but also a fairly low ranking on black-white disparities; and — most significantly for our purpose -- Chicago ranks in the middle on white status but lowest of any SMSA on black-white disparities. If one examines the ranking of blacks among these SMSAs, as summarized in Table 13, it can be seen that Chicago's blacks are overall worse off in socio-economic terms than blacks in any other major metropolitan area. Clearly Chicago's white population is doing reasonably well, but this relative abundance does not extend to cover Chicago's blacks.

Blacks in Sunbelt SMSAs will experience less black-white disparity in socio-economic status than will blacks in Frostbelt SMSAs.

More than any of the previous hypotheses, this one seems to rely more heavily on a dynamic rather than a static underlying factor: the process of disinvestment occurring in older northern industrial centers vs. the process of growth and investment occurring in southern and western urban areas. This hypothesis also seems to have some promise. With the exception of Nassau-Suffolk and the minor reversal of San Francisco-Oakland and New York between ranks 6 and 7, the socio-economic disparity between blacks and whites is consistently larger in

Frostbelt than in Sunbelt SMSAs.

Even though this hypothesis may shed some minimal light on the general pattern of black-white disparities in socio-economic status among major SMSAs, it is incapable of accounting for Chicago's rather remarkable showing. That is, the hypothesis only explicitly calls for a rough dichotomy of SMSAs rather than offering a basis for predicting which single SMSA would have the largest or smallest overall racial inequity in socio-economic status. If, however, we were to use and empirically test a hypothesis based on the rate of disinvestment in each SMSA in recent years, then Chicago's unique status could potentially be accounted for. Without the appropriate data, one can only say in this report that the rate of disinvestment may be one of the more significant factors producing the large racial disparity in socio-economic status which is so prevalent in Chicago.

One should not, however, be overly optimistic about the explanatory power of a disinvestment measure. White Chicagoans are generally doing better than whites in other SMSAs suffering disinvestment, while black Chicagoans are generally doing worse than blacks in other disinvesting SMSAs. There appears to be little potential for a disinvestment measure to account for these extremes.

Conclusion

What can we conclude about the socio-economic status of minorities in our major centers as of 1980? There are several points which have emerged in this study.

1. Blacks in all of the larger SMSAs in this country are experiencing consistently lower socio-economic status than majority whites.
2. To a slightly lesser degree the same pattern also holds for Hispanics, though Hispanics generally fare better than blacks.

3. Compared to other metropolitan areas, blacks in Chicago are experiencing the largest overall deficits in socio-economic status relative to majority whites living in the same area.

4. The comparable disparities between Hispanics and majority whites in Chicago rank fourth largest out of 11, behind Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

5. The extraordinarily large socio-economic gap between blacks and majority whites in Chicago does not appear to be readily explicable by any of a variety of demographic factors which were examined.

6. Though the Sunbelt-Frostbelt distinction seems to have some overall bearing on the magnitude of black-white disparities across the country, the available evidence suggests that the disinvestment of older industrial cities in the North cannot account for Chicago's particularly poor showing.

7. One needs to recognize that no single factor can be expected to perfectly account for the ordering of SMSAs on our measures of minority-majority disparities. There are unique circumstances in every urban area and there are undoubtedly several dimensions which help to produce the pattern of minority status found in this study.

Beyond these conclusions, one can only speculate about some of the unique and varied reasons for the extraordinary levels of racial inequity which exist in Chicago. We do know that blacks in Chicago continue to be more segregated residentially than are blacks in any other large metropolitan area in America. There also is a broad array of local evidence to suggest that, in the public sector, "boss" or "organization" politics has for decades funneled most resources to non-black sections of the community; while in the private sector blacks have persistently been excluded from policy-making positions in the major businesses which largely determine employment and other aspects of life quality of Chicago. Perhaps midwestern conservatism, the prevalence in Chicago of strong ethnic communities which are particularly hostile to blacks, and/or some other factors are part of the root causes of the especially large socio-economic gap between blacks and whites in this city.

Regardless of the explanation, one point is clear. Chicagoans need to recognize the severity of the racial inequities which exist in this city, and we must begin to make a concerted effort to reduce this gap in the years immediately ahead.

TABLE 1
1980 POPULATION AND RACIAL/ETHNIC COMPOSITION
OF ALL SMSAs IN U.S. WITH 2.5 MILLION OR MORE RESIDENTS

	Total Population	Number of Blacks	% Black	Number of Whites	% Whites	Number of Hispanics	% Hispanics
Boston	2,763,357	160,434	5.8	2,535,506	91.8	65,696	2.4
Chicago	7,103,624	1,427,847	20.1	5,216,080	73.4	580,467	8.2
Dallas-Ft. Worth	2,974,805	419,200	14.1	2,369,103	79.6	247,937	8.3
Detroit	4,353,413	890,532	20.5	3,397,326	78.0	72,718	1.7
Houston	2,905,353	528,510	18.2	2,117,088	72.9	424,957	14.6
L.A.-Long Beach	7,477,503	944,855	12.6	5,105,459	68.3	2,066,103	27.6
Nassau-Suffolk	2,605,813	162,484	6.2	2,395,495	91.9	102,097	3.9
New York	9,120,346	1,946,057	21.3	6,162,949	67.6	492,559	16.4
Philadelphia	4,716,818	884,527	18.8	3,720,670	78.9	116,869	2.5
S.F.-Oakland	3,250,630	391,337	12.3	2,391,461	73.6	349,324	10.7
Washington, D.C.	3,060,922	853,746	27.9	2,084,841	68.1	93,686	3.1

TABLE 2
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	$23,247	$12,445	$10,802	4	$ 9,586	$13,661	1
Chicago	25,644	12,716	12,928	1	16,557	9,093	5
Dallas-Ft. Worth	23,602	13,675	9,927	8	15,754	7,848	8
Detroit	25,625	15,761	9,864	9	21,112	4,513	10
Houston	26,439	16,069	10,370	6	17,185	9,254	4
L.A.-Long Beach	23,404	16,469	6,935	10	15,447	7,957	7
Nassau-Suffolk	26,406	21,343	5,063	11	22,178	4,228	11
New York	23,208	12,407	10,801	5	10,347	12,861	2
Philadelphia	23,246	13,166	10,080	7	13,287	9,959	3
S.F.-Oakland	26,932	15,146	11,786	2	20,227	6,705	9
Washington D.C.	31,004	19,329	11,675	3	22,834	8,170	6

TABLE 3
% PERSONS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	8.9	25.9	17.0	6	42.0	33.1	1
Chicago	6.0	34.5	28.5	1	19.5	13.5	5
Dallas-Ft. Worth	6.5	25.1	18.6	4	20.1	13.6	4
Detroit	6.9	29.0	22.1	3	16.5	9.6	8
Houston	6.5	22.4	15.9	7	18.1	11.6	6
L.A.-Long Beach	9.8	18.1	8.3	11	21.2	11.4	7
Nassau-Suffolk	4.6	17.0	12.4	8.5	11.1	6.5	9
New York	11.0	28.6	17.6	5	39.3	28.3	2
Philadelphia	7.2	30.2	23.0	2	33.5	26.3	3
S.F.-Oakland	6.4	17.6	11.2	10	10.8	4.4	11
Washington D.C.	4.7	17.1	12.4	8.5	10.6	5.9	10

TABLE 4
LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	63.4	54.2	9.2	2	51.6	11.8	1
Chicago	66.3	56.6	9.7	1	72.3	-6.0	11
Dallas-Ft.Worth	69.9	67.0	2.9	6	70.8	-0.9	7
Detroit	62.4	55.4	7.0	3	65.1	-2.7	8
Houston	70.8	69.8	1.0	10	67.1	3.7	5
L.A.-Long Beach	65.1	62.7	2.4	7	67.6	2.5	6
Nassau-Suffolk	63.0	67.5	-4.5	11	67.0	4.0	4
New York	59.5	57.4	2.1	8	52.1	7.4	2
Philadelphia	61.6	53.6	4.2	4	56.2	5.4	3
S.F.-Oakland	65.0	63.6	1.4	9	69.5	-4.5	10
Washington D.C.	71.6	67.5	4.1	5	75.2	-3.6	9

TABLE 5
POPULATION - EMPLOYMENT RATIO

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	60.7	48.1	12.6	4	45.2	15.5	1
Chicago	62.1	48.1	14.0	1.5	61.6	0.5	6
Dallas-Ft. Worth	67.6	62.6	5.0	9	67.3	0.3	7
Detroit	55.7	41.7	14.0	1.5	54.7	1.0	5
Houston	68.6	66.6	2.0	10	63.6	5.0	4
L.A.-Long Beach	61.6	56.1	5.5	7.5	62.5	-0.9	8
Nassau-Suffolk	59.9	61.6	1.7	11	63.2	-3.3	11
New York	56.3	50.3	6.0	6	46.5	9.8	3
Philadelphia	56.8	43.9	12.9	3	45.4	11.4	2
S.F.-Oakland	61.5	54.9	6.6	5	63.6	-2.1	9
Washington D.C.	66.7	61.2	5.5	7.5	69.1	-2.4	10

TABLE 6
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	4.13	11.14	2.70	4	8.20	4.07	4
Chicago	5.20	14.17	2.72	3	14.20	9.00	1
Dallas-Ft. Worth	2.34	6.41	2.74	1	4.11	1.77	8
Detroit	10.58	24.63	2.33	8	15.99	5.41	3
Houston	2.99	4.51	1.51	11	4.97	1.98	7
L.A.-Long Beach	5.25	10.29	1.96	9	7.45	2.20	6
Nassau-Suffolk	4.89	8.76	1.79	10	5.72	0.83	10
New York	5.22	12.31	2.36	6	3.56	-1.66	11
Philadelphia	6.85	16.52	2.41	5	13.99	7.14	2
S.F.-Oakland	4.69	12.81	2.73	2	8.11	3.42	5
Washington D.C.	2.91	6.85	2.35	7	4.10	1.19	9

TABLE 7
% FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	15.18	56.41	41.23	1	41.86	26.68	2
Chicago	12.22	52.02	39.80	3	19.54	7.32	5
Dallas-Ft. Worth	11.75	37.12	25.37	8	13.35	1.60	9
Detroit	12.62	53.31	40.69	2	23.30	10.68	4
Houston	11.14	33.24	22.10	10	10.63	0.51	11
L.A.-Long Beach	17.28	38.83	21.55	11	18.30	1.02	10
Nassau-Suffolk	9.97	33.03	23.06	9	14.83	4.86	7
New York	17.45	49.78	32.33	6	45.26	27.81	1
Philadelphia	11.87	47.20	35.33	4	36.21	24.34	3
S.F.-Oakland	15.43	48.19	32.76	5	20.74	5.31	6
Washington D.C.	12.58	38.29	25.71	7	16.45	3.87	8

TABLE 8
% COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	76.8	65.1	11.7	8.5	57.3	19.5	5
Chicago	68.8	52.0	16.8	2	36.1	32.7	4
Dallas-Ft. Worth	72.0	58.2	13.8	6	35.8	36.2	1
Detroit	69.0	55.3	13.7	7	51.4	17.6	7
Houston	73.1	56.9	16.2	4	37.1	36.0	2
L.A.-Long Beach	74.2	71.7	2.5	11	39.9	34.4	3
Nassau-Suffolk	76.2	65.4	10.8	10	59.9	16.3	8
New York	68.0	56.3	11.7	8.5	66.1	1.9	11
Philadelphia	98.4	52.7	15.7	5	56.8	11.6	9
S.F.-Oakland	81.5	64.8	16.7	3	62.8	18.7	6
Washington D.C.	85.1	65.7	19.4	1	74.5	10.6	10

TABLE 9
% OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITHIN OWN RACIAL GROUP

	White	Black	W-B Difference	Rank	Hispanic	W-H Difference	Rank
Boston	55.5	23.0	32.5	1	22.8	32.7	2
Chicago	64.5	33.5	31.0	2	31.1	33.4	1
Dallas-Ft. Worth	65.6	46.6	19.0	6	45.8	19.8	5
Detroit	76.1	52.8	23.3	4	59.1	17.0	7
Houston	62.8	47.2	15.6	10	43.4	19.4	6
L.A.-Long Beach	52.0	39.1	12.9	11	36.9	15.1	9
Nassau-Suffolk	80.5	61.0	19.5	5	64.6	15.9	8
New York	36.6	18.4	18.2	8	11.0	26.6	3
Philadelphia	71.4	53.6	17.8	9	57.6	13.8	10
S.F.-Oakland	56.0	37.6	18.4	7	45.4	10.6	11
Washington D.C.	61.2	37.1	24.1	3	39.2	22.0	4

TABLE 10

RANKING OF BLACK-WHITE DIFFERENCES IN
ALL SMSAs WITH POPULATIONS OF 2.5 MILLION OR MORE

ALL SMSAs	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME	% PERSONS BELOW POVERTY	LABOR-FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE	POPULATION EMPLOYMENT RATIO	UNEMPLOY-MENT RATE	% FEMALE HEADED HOUSE-HOLD WITH CHILDREN	% 25 YEAR OLDS WITH HIGH SCH. GRADUATE OR MORE	% OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT	OVERALL RANKING
Boston	4	6	2	4	6	1	8.5	1	3
Chicago	1	1	1	1.5	3	3	2	2	1
Dallas-Ft. Worth	8	4	6	9	8	8	6	6	8
Detroit	9	3	3	1.5	1	2	7	4	2
Houston	6	7	10	10	11	10	4	10	9
L.A.-Long Beach	10	11	7	7.5	7	11	11	11	10.5
Nassau-Suffolk	11	8.5	11	11	10	9	10	5	10.5
New York	5	5	8	6	5	6	8.5	8	7
Philadelphia	7	2	4	3	2	4	5	9	4
S.F.-Oakland	2	10	9	5	4	5	3	7	6
Washington D.C.	3	8.5	5	7.5	9	7	1	3	5

TABLE 11
RANKING OF HISPANIC-WHITE DIFFERENCES IN
ALL SMSAs WITH POPULATIONS OF 2.5 MILLION OR MORE

ALL SMSAs	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME	% PERSONS BELOW POVERTY	LABOR-FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE	POPULATION EMPLOYMENT RATIO	UNEMPLOY-MENT RATE	% FEMALE HEADED HOUSE-HOLD WITH CHILDREN	% 25 YEAR OLDS WITH HIGH SCH. GRADUATE OR MORE	% OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT	OVERALL RANKING
Boston	1	1	1	1	4	2	5	2	1
Chicago	5	5	11	6	1	5	4	1	4
Dallas-Ft. Worth	8	4	7	7	8	9	1	5	6
Detroit	10	8	8	5	3	4	7	7	7
Houston	4	6	5	4	7	11	2	6	5
L.A.-Long Beach	7	7	6	8	6	10	3	9	8
Nassau-Suffolk	11	9	4	11	10	7	8	8	11
New York	2	2	2	3	11	1	11	3	2
Philadelphia	3	3	3	2	3	3	9	10	3
S.F.-Oakland	9	11	10	9	5	6	6	11	10
Washington D.C.	6	10	9	10	9	8	10	4	9

19.

TABLE 12
RANKING OF WHITES IN ALL SMSAs
WITH POPULATIONS OF 2.5 MILLION OR MORE

ALL SMSAs	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME	% PERSONS BELOW POVERTY	LABOR-FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE	POPULATION EMPLOYMENT RATIO	UNEMPLOY-MENT RATE	% FEMALE HEADED HOUSE-HOLD WITH CHILDREN	% 25 YEAR OLDS WITH HIGH SCH. GRADUATE OR MORE	% OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT	OVERALL RANKING
Boston	9	9	7	7	4	8	3	9	7
Chicago	5	3	4	4	7	5	9	5	5.5
Dallas-Ft. Worth	7	5.5	3	2	1	3	7	4	3
Detroit	6	7	9	11	11	7	8	2	8
Houston	3	5.5	2	1	3	2	6	6	2
L.A.-Long Beach	8	10	5	5	9	10	5	10	9
Nassau-Suffolk	4	1	8	8	6	1	4	1	4
New York	11	11	11	10	8	11	11	11	11
Philadelphia	10	8	10	9	10	4	10	3	10
S.F.-Oakland	2	4	6	6	5	9	2	8	5.5
Washington D.C.	1	2	1	3	2	6	1	7	1

TABLE 13
RANKING OF BLACKS IN ALL SMSAs
WITH POPULATIONS OF 2.5 MILLION OR MORE

ALL SMSAs	MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME	% PERSONS BELOW POVERTY	LABOR-FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE	POPULATION EMPLOYMENT RATIO	UNEMPLOY-MENT RATE	% FEMALE HEADED HOUSE-HOLD WITH CHILDREN	% 25 YEAR OLDS WITH HIGH SCH. GRADUATE OR MORE	% OWNER OCCUPIED HOUSING UNIT	OVERALL RANKING
Boston	2	5	2	3.5	6	1	8	2	5
Chicago	3	1	4	3.5	3	3	1	3	1
Dallas-Ft. Worth	5	6	8	10	10	9	6	7	7.5
Detroit	7	3	3	1	1	2	3	9	3
Houston	8	7	11	11	11	10	5	8	10
L.A.-Long Beach	9	8	6	7	7	7	11	6	7.5
Nassau-Suffolk	11	10.5	9.5	9	8	11	9	11	11
New York	1	4	5	5	5	4	4	1	3
Philadelphia	4	2	1	2	2	6	2	10	3
S.F.-Oakland	6	9	7	6	4	5	7	5	6
Washington D.C.	10	10.5	9.5	8	9	8	10	4	9

FOOTNOTES

1. Bureau of the Census, "Provisional Estimates of Social Economic, and Housing Characteristics - States and Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas," PHC80-51-1, 1980 Census of Population and Housing, U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1982.

2. It is conceivable that New York and Nassau-Suffolk would be more closely in accord with this hypothesis if they were combined into a single metropolitan area. That is, combining the relatively few higher socio-economic status blacks in Nassau-Suffolk with the large number of low status blacks in New York might not lift overall black status so much as adding the fairly large number of high status whites in Nassau-Suffolk to New York's figures would raise white totals. While a combined SMSA would very likely increase the black-white gap in New York, it clearly would not move that city past Chicago. Further, if one were to argue for combining the New York and Nassau-Suffolk SMSAs into one area, it would be difficult to argue against adding part of New Jersey and other proximate metropolitan areas in as well. Where does one draw the line? For simplicity sake, it seems best to accept the Census Bureau's designations of distinct SMSAs.